



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 142

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 18, 1996

No. 37

Senate

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable CHUCK GRASSLEY, a Senator from the State of Iowa.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Gracious Father, we are irresistibly drawn into Your presence by the magnetism of Your love. You know all about us and offer forgiveness. You know our needs and grant us Your strength. You know our responsibilities and assure us of Your intervening help. You know the decisions that we must make this week and remind us that if we will seek Your guidance You will show us the way. Jog our memories about Your faithfulness in the past so that we may trust You with our present concerns.

As we begin this new week, give us a renewed vision of our high calling to serve You in government. May all that we do be done for Your glory. Lift us to the sublime level of excellence that is achieved only when we seek to please You above all else. May our work be an expression of our worship of You. Therefore, we will attempt great things for You and know that we will receive great power from You. In our Lord's name. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 18, 1996.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable CHUCK GRASSLEY, a

Senator from the State of Iowa, to perform the duties of the Chair.

STROM THURMOND,
President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). The acting majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, for the information of our colleagues, today there will be a period for morning business until the hour of 12 noon, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

Following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 3019, which is the omnibus appropriations bill. No rollcall votes will occur during today's session of the Senate. Senators are expected, however, to debate their amendments today, with any requested rollcall votes on those amendments to begin at 2:15 p.m. on Tuesday. Senators should expect a lengthy series of rollcall votes beginning at 2:15, and the Senate will complete action on the omnibus appropriations bill on Tuesday.

Also during tomorrow's session, the Senate will vote on passage of S. 942, the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act, a cloture vote on the motion to proceed to the Whitewater Committee resolution, as well as a cloture vote on the product liability conference report.

So we need to complete our debate on the amendments to the omnibus appropriations bill today, and then we will have a series of recorded votes on Tuesday beginning at 2:15.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business for a period not to exceed the hour of 12 noon, with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 5 minutes each.

The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I see the distinguished acting Republican leader on the floor. I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to proceed for 10 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BANNING ANTIPERSONNEL LANDMINES

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have some photographs here that have become all too familiar to the Senate. This is a photograph of a young boy, a victim of a landmine. You can see from the photograph, he has one badly injured leg, another leg that has been torn off, and an arm that is also missing. These are similar to photographs I have on my Web page in my office on the Internet. Thousands of people turn to that Web page, and what they see there are these photographs of landmine victims.

Here is one that they turn to, this young woman. I have had somebody tell me that as the picture comes down on the computer screen, the page ends at the bottom of her long skirt. Then they click on further and the picture

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

S2213

continues down and they realize she has only one leg. This woman is from Laos. She lost her leg from a landmine.

Mr. President, these photographs are not unusual. Each one represents a tragedy, of course, not only for the person involved, but also but for his or her family. These are only two victims. There are hundreds of thousands of victims of antipersonnel landmines alive today, and of course as many more who died. They are the victims of these tiny, hidden explosives that litter whole countries. They are scattered like seed. They are a blight on our planet, and they must be stopped. This mine I am holding in my hand cost \$2 or \$3, and is made almost entirely of plastic to make it harder to detect.

These are not weapons that know the difference between a combatant or civilian. They are, as somebody else said, the only weapon where the unsuspecting victim pulls the trigger.

A little over a year ago, President Clinton, in a courageous speech at the United Nations, declared the goal of ridding the world of antipersonnel landmines. With 100 million of these weapons in over 60 countries waiting to explode, they have become the world's most devastating cause of indiscriminate, mass suffering.

Every 22 minutes, the State Department estimates someone somewhere, usually an innocent civilian, is killed or maimed from stepping on a landmine.

NATO forces have suffered 42 landmine casualties since they arrived in Bosnia in December, including 7 deaths. There were three casualties just last Friday, all soldiers of our European allies. Landmines are, by far, the worst threat to our troops there, but also to the people of Bosnia who will be clearing these landmines, an arm and a leg at a time, for decades to come.

The entire 184-member U.N. General Assembly adopted the goal announced by the President. But since President Clinton's announcement, a debate has ensued over how to reach the goal of eliminating antipersonnel mines.

The Pentagon, which says it shares the goal, pushed a strategy to promote the use of so-called smart mines. Mr. President, technology has an answer for many things, but this is not one of them. Antipersonnel landmines are by nature indiscriminate.

There is nothing smart about a landmine that cannot tell the difference between a soldier and a 5-year-old child. These mines are scattered from the air by the tens of thousands, and the same areas can be reseeded many times during a conflict. They legitimize the use of landmines despite their indiscriminate effect.

I am very pleased that Pentagon officials are now questioning the distinction between smart and dumb mines. Again, landmines are by nature indiscriminate. That is what makes them so insidious. I also want to commend our U.N. Ambassador, Madeleine Albright,

and her Deputy Karl Inderfurth, who have urged a stronger policy against antipersonnel mines.

A growing coalition, from our soldiers in Bosnia to retired Army generals to officials in the Pentagon to the Pope and the American Red Cross, are urging that we renounce these weapons as we have nerve gas and other indiscriminate killers.

On February 12, my amendment to impose a moratorium on U.S. use of antipersonnel mines was signed into law by President Clinton. That amendment had broad bipartisan support with over two-thirds of the U.S. Senate of both parties voting for it. It represents a clear shift in U.S. policy. But it is already being eclipsed by events elsewhere.

In the past 2 months, Canada and the Netherlands have unilaterally banned their use of antipersonnel mines, and they have joined 22 other countries that have called for an immediate international ban. Many of these countries have been among the largest contributors to U.N. peacekeeping forces, and they have seen the havoc wreaked by landmines. Several, like Belgium and Austria, are destroying their stockpiles of these weapons.

Mr. President, yesterday's New York Times ran a front page story entitled "Pentagon Weighs Ending Opposition to a Ban on Mines." It reports that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Shalikashvili, has ordered a review of the landmine issue. I want to applaud General Shalikashvili for this. There is nothing harder than challenging the conventional wisdom, and when others have said something cannot be done, to ask why not and to look for a way to do it.

I want to reiterate what I have said before. There is a tremendous opportunity here for U.S. leadership. We should listen to our Armed Forces veterans, many of whom say antipersonnel mines made their job more dangerous, not safer, and who remember their buddies being blown up by their own minefields.

Over 7,400 of the Americans killed in Vietnam, 20 percent in the Persian Gulf, and 26 percent in Somalia died from landmines. We have more to gain if the use of landmines is a war crime.

We should think of the devastation these weapons are causing around the world. Regardless of what some here may think, the world does look to the United States for leadership. We are the most powerful democracy ever known in history, by far the most powerful nation on Earth. We can exert great moral and political leadership when we want to lead as a country. The President can lead. There are few people more persuasive when he is convinced of something. I have seen him in meetings with world leaders, and I know how effective he can be. With the support of the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, the President could bring enormous pressure to bear on world leaders to follow our example.

It is not just the example of the Leahy amendment, but the leadership to press ahead for a ban on antipersonnel landmines worldwide.

Mr. President, this is not a Democrat or Republican issue. It is not a matter of civilians versus the military. It is an opportunity for the United States to end this millennium as the leader of a global effort to ban a weapon that Civil War General Sherman called "a violation of civilized warfare."

Mr. President, I commend the Congress for first adopting the moratorium that I proposed, the moratorium on the export of landmines from this country.

I commend the President for supporting my efforts in introducing a resolution in the United Nations to call for the eventual elimination of antipersonnel landmines.

I also commend the U.S. Senate, Republicans and Democrats, conservatives, liberals, moderates joining together to vote for a moratorium on the use of landmines by the United States. Each one of these steps, Mr. President, has given hope and encouragement to other countries. Each one of these steps has reinforced our leadership.

Years ago when I first started on this quest, it seemed a lonely one. So many times Tim Rieser and I would visit other countries, and here on Capitol Hill and to the United Nations, to speak to world leaders and U.N. ambassadors about landmines. At first, we heard only a few encouraging words. But then the International Red Cross, for the first time since the 1920's when it condemned chemical weapons, called for a ban on antipersonnel mines. Then the Pope, and the leaders of so many other nations, especially those who had sent peacekeepers overseas, humanitarian organizations like the American Red Cross, religious organizations, veterans organizations—they are all speaking out against the use of these weapons.

Mr. President, the only way to stop the use of antipersonnel landmines is to stop the use of antipersonnel landmines. When 100 million of these killers are hidden in the ground in over 60 countries, we have to say "enough is enough." Another 2 million are being added each year.

The only way we will stop this is to ban their use, and to turn our attention to the immense job of clearing the mines that have turned so many parts of the world into death traps.

This is an issue whose time has come. I commend those at the Pentagon, the White House, and here in the Congress, in both parties, who have supported this effort so far. Let us go one step further, and make this for all time U.S. policy, to ban their use; and then go to our allies around the world, and to other countries, and say, join with us in what is both a security and a moral imperative.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from yesterday's New York Times and an Associated Press article related to the subject be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 17, 1996]

PENTAGON WEIGHS ENDING OPPOSITION TO A BAN ON MINES

POLICY REVIEW ORDERED—THREAT TO U.S. FORCE IN BOSNIA BRINGS RECONSIDERATION OF MOVES AGAINST WEAPON

(By Raymond Bonner)

WASHINGTON, March 16.—With the daily threat of land mines to American soldiers in Bosnia having brought the issue home, Gen. John Shalikashvili, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has ordered a review of the military's longstanding opposition to banning the use of land mines, which kill or maim more than 20,000 people a year, primarily civilians.

In asking for the review last week during a meeting with the chiefs of the military services, General Shalikashvili said he was "inclined to eliminate all anti-personnel land mines," a senior Pentagon official said.

The Pentagon was prompted to review its policy in part by a strong bipartisan anti-mine sentiment in Congress, led by Senator Patrick J. Leahy, Democrat of Vermont, as well as by a growing international campaign to ban antipersonnel mines, Pentagon officials said.

These separate Congressional and international campaigns against mines gained new momentum after American soldiers began arriving in December in Bosnia, where an estimated three million land mines have been planted. Three American soldiers have since been wounded by the weapons.

Nearly a dozen countries have banned the use of land mines. Senator Leahy and other advocates of a ban argue that if the United States renounced their manufacture, sale and use, many other countries would follow. While they concede that there would still be outlaw states, they counter that an international ban backed by sanctions would result in a substantial overall reduction in the use of land mines.

Pentagon officials say General Shalikashvili acted after he and Defense Secretary William J. Perry received a confidential letter from the American representative to the United Nations, Madeleine K. Albright, who has just returned from a trip to Angola. That country has many young men and children whose limbs were ripped off in landmine explosions.

Ms. Albright wrote that a new policy on land mines was urgently needed, because the Administration's current policy would not achieve their elimination "within our lifetimes." She sent copies to other senior Administration officials; parts of the letter were read to The New York Times by a supporter of the ban who had received a copy.

Two years ago in a speech at the United Nations, President Clinton called for the "eventual elimination" of land mines. Under current policy, the Administration supports an amendment to the 1980 Convention on Conventional Weapons that would allow the use of only "smart" mines, which deactivate or destroy themselves after a few weeks or months.

The United States was barred by Congress in 1993 from exporting land mines for three years. Another law prohibits the United States from using land mines for one year in 1999.

There are an estimated 100 million land mines planted in 62 countries, and an official with the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency said last week that the number is increasing by two million a year. The State Department has said 600 people a month are killed or wounded by mines; the American

Red Cross has estimated that it is twice that many.

This week, the Dutch Government renounced the use of land mines, joining Canada, Mexico, Belgium, Austria, Norway and five other countries; France recently prohibited the production and export of land mines. Twenty-four countries have called for an international ban, according to the latest tally by Human Rights Watch, the New York-based human rights organization, which has been a leader in an international campaign for a ban.

Last fall, the International Committee of the Red Cross opened a campaign to ban antipersonnel land mines. It was a highly unusual step for the Swiss organization, which is not an advocacy organization and only once before has called for a weapons ban—of chemical weapons, back in the 1920's.

"We've simply seen too much," said Urs Boegli, director of the Red Cross's land mine campaign, explaining why the organization had acted.

More than any other single organization, the Red Cross works in conflicts around the world, he said. He added that the Red Cross had begun its ban campaign only after having fought unsuccessfully to strengthen the 1980 conventional weapons treaty to restrict their use.

China and Russia, which each have stockpiles of more than 100 million mines, have been the major countries blocking an amendment to the convention that would allow all but "smart" mines.

In the Pentagon, the Office of Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict has pushed for a complete ban on all antipersonnel mines—"smart" and "dumb"—except in limited situations, such as along the border between North and South Korea.

Land mines should be put in the category of chemical weapons, said Timothy Connolly, principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for special operations. Even though they have military utility, chemical weapons have been banned because of their devastating consequences, to soldiers and civilians.

"Some day, and that day has to be sooner rather than later, we are going to reach that same conclusion about antipersonnel land mines," Mr. Connolly, who was an Army captain during the Persian Gulf War, said during an interview this week.

Mr. Connolly's office rejects the "smart" mine compromise.

The basis of the American support for such a compromise is that it is possible to develop a mine that will self-destruct or self-deactivate with 99.7 percent certainty, according to Robert Sherman, director of advanced projects of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and a negotiator in talks on amending the conventional weapons pact.

But Mr. Connolly said, "There is no evidence in the United States that we are capable of building a device capable of working 100 percent or nearly 100 percent of the time."

Until this recent review, Mr. Connolly's voice had been a lonely one in the Pentagon.

Pentagon officials predicted that the Army and Marine Corps would fight the hardest to be allowed to keep at least some land mines, Pentagon officials said. Military doctrine calls for land mines to reduce the number of soldiers needed in certain situations, to canalize the enemy and to protect vital installations, like power stations.

In the closed-door meeting last week when Gen. Shalikashvili ordered the review, the chiefs of the Army and Marine Corps said they needed land mines to police the border between North and South Korea, a Pentagon Official said.

"The U.S. Army's position is that we use land mines responsibly," said an Army general who spoke on condition of anonymity.

Senator Leahy believes, however, that with American troops in Bosnia, if President Clinton renounced the use of land mines, "he would get very substantial support in the military." Mr. Leahy, who has led a four-year effort in Congress to ban land mines, said he was constantly hearing from servicemen, from sergeants to generals, who urge him on.

Recently, he received an E-mail message from an Air Force master sergeant, Dale A. Lamell, on duty in Bosnia, who wrote: "I would like to salute you for your efforts to eliminate the international use of land mines. Bosnia should serve as an example to the rest of the world."

Requesting anonymity, a senior military officer at the Pentagon also said this week that there was considerably more support among officers for getting rid of land mines than emerges publicly.

Freed from the constraints of being in uniform, several prominent retired generals have agreed to sign an open letter to the President calling for an international ban on the production and use of antipersonnel land mines, said Robert Muller, director of the Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation, which began soliciting signers three weeks ago. Among them are Gen. Frederick R. Woerner, a former commander of the United States Southern Command in Panama, and Lieut. Gen. Harold Moore, a former commander of the Seventh Infantry Division and author of "We Were Soldiers Once . . . and Young."

"I very much oppose antipersonnel land mines because they are indeed indiscriminate in their killing and maiming," Gen. H. Norman Schwarzkopf wrote this month in a letter to Frank J. Fahrenkopf Jr., who was chairman of the Republican National Committee during the Reagan Presidency and who had written to the general asking him to join the campaign to ban antipersonnel mines.

Though he said he wanted to think a bit longer before deciding whether to sign the letter to the President, General Schwarzkopf said his wish to see land mines "forever eliminated from warfare" was based on his personal experiences of "having seen hundreds of my own troops killed or maimed by them," as well as being "keenly aware of the devastating effects" of land mines on civilians.

[From the Associated Press, Mar. 17, 1996]

SENATOR PRAISES PENTAGON FOR RECONSIDERING LANDMINE USE

(By Sally Buzbee)

WASHINGTON.—A Senator long opposed to U.S. use of land mines said Sunday he's delighted the Pentagon will reevaluate its position that the deadly, hidden weapons are needed for troop safety.

"There are certain weapons you just don't use," said Sen. Patrick Leahy, D-VT.

A Pentagon spokesman confirmed Sunday that a review of the military's longstanding policy on anti-personnel land mines was under review.

"It's been an ongoing issue here," said Pentagon spokesman Major Steve Manuel. "We're still in the process of examining it."

Gen. John Shalikashvili, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, ordered the review last week, The New York Times reported Sunday. A senior Pentagon official told the newspaper that Shalikashvili was "inclined to eliminate all anti-personnel land mines."

Worldwide, the use of land mines targeted at people, not tanks, has escalated in the last 15 years. They now kill or injure 26,000

people each year, the State Department estimates.

Most victims are civilians in war-torn countries like Angola, Cambodia, Vietnam and El Salvador, but land mines also pose risks to U.S. troops participating in the Bosnian peacekeeping mission.

U.N. Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali and the International Red Cross have urged a worldwide ban on land mines. And Canada, Austria, Norway, Holland, Belgium, Mexico, the Netherlands and five other countries already have renounced their use.

But until now, U.S. military officials have insisted they needed the option of using land mines to protect the lives of American soldiers. They also have argued that the United States should not give up a weapon if other nations won't.

Despite Pentagon objections, Leahy pushed through Congress a one-year ban on the military's use of anti-personnel land mines, except along borders and in demilitarized zones. The ban would begin sometime within three years, and President Clinton signed it into law.

"The rest of the world wants the United States to lead on this," Leahy said in an interview Sunday. "If the most powerful nation in the world can't do away with land mines, how can we ever persuade other countries to?"

Shalikhshvili ordered the review of Pentagon policy after he and Defense Secretary William J. Perry received a confidential letter from the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, Madeleine K. Albright, the Times said.

Albright, who had just returned from Angola, urged that the current policy on land mines be changed, the Times said. Parts of the letter were read to the newspaper by an unidentified official who received a copy.

Leahy argues that many military officials, both retired and active-duty, also privately support a permanent ban on land mines.

"This is not a Republican-Democratic, liberal-conservative or civilian versus military issue," Leahy said.

The Pentagon estimates Bosnia has 3 million land mines and Croatia another 3 million. Some are sophisticated; others crude or homemade. NATO officials say no more than 30 percent have been mapped.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I see nobody else seeking the floor, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been noted. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistance legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I do not see anybody seeking recognition, so I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as in morning business for 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NUCLEAR TERRORISM

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the General Accounting Office has released a report which describes the appalling state of Russia's nuclear waste storage facilities. It described how a GAO investigator was able to enter one facil-

ity without identifying himself, and there was only one guard present, who was unarmed. There are other descriptions of incredibly lax security that even the most inept thief could easily penetrate undetected. It is almost an open invitation.

The implications of this are staggering. A grapefruit-sized ball of uranium, which would weigh about 30 pounds, could obliterate the lower half of the city of New York. A lot more uranium than that is already unaccounted for. We do not know whether it is in the hands of terrorists, or where it is. All we know is that it is missing.

We have already witnessed several instances of nuclear smuggling, in some cases enough uranium to cause incalculable damage. The fact that these attempts were thwarted should not give anyone a lot of confidence about the future because many, if not most, crimes go unsolved.

Mr. President, I mention this today both because of the timeliness of the GAO report, but also because we spend countless hours, sometimes days and months, here holding hearings on arcane topics and debating sometimes relatively meaningless resolutions, unless it is meaningful for someone's campaign, or voting repeatedly on issues that pale in importance to the dangers of nuclear terrorism. We make speeches about it. I am making one now. But when it comes to providing the money and other resources to seriously address this threat, the Congress oftentimes shirks its responsibility.

One good example is in the foreign aid budget. Some Members of Congress were eager to take credit for sharply cutting funds for foreign aid last year over the objection of myself and a minority of other Senators. To his credit, Senator MCCONNELL, the chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, supported funds to combat international crime, as did I. But the budget was cut anyway. In fact, some of those funds could have been used to help safeguard nuclear material in countries of the former Soviet Union. It would be hard to think of an example where foreign aid is more in the interest of the security of the American people.

I want to single out Senator NUNN and Senator LUGAR, who have led the effort in Congress to get funds appropriated to safeguard nuclear weapons in the former Soviet Union. Senator NUNN made the point in today's issue of Defense News, when he said "there is skepticism about spending any money in Russia. Nunn-Lugar funds are often described as foreign aid, in quotes, as if some type of charitable giving was going on * * *. We are talking about dismantling warheads and missiles aimed at us * * * things we spent trillions of dollars trying to arm ourselves against."

We are about to begin the fiscal year 1997 budget process. I hope that the Congress does not make the same mistake twice. I hope Members of Congress

will read this GAO report on nuclear proliferation. Unlike some Government reports that you can read to help fall asleep at night, this one will keep you awake. Cutting these programs is the ultimate example of penny-wise, pound-foolish. I am already hearing rumors that foreign aid may be slashed again this year. If that happens, some of those who vote that way should ask themselves what responsibility they bear.

There is no way to guarantee the safety and security of fissile material, but there is a lot more that we and others can and should do to combat the threat of nuclear terrorism. It is going to cost a lot of money. Budgets are already stretched, but can anyone here say that we can afford to watch this problem get worse? This is about the security of every American, and of future generations.

So I urge the Department of Defense, the Department of State, the Department of Energy, and other agencies with responsibility for nuclear safety to develop an effective program to combat this threat. Tell us what needs to be done, and come to Congress with a request for adequate funding for it.

I wish there were better security controls in the former Soviet Union, but there are not. That is the reality, and it is a reality that a lot of thieves, a lot of would-be terrorists know even better than we do.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask unanimous consent that I be given 5 minutes as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the Chair.

CHINA-TAIWAN RELATIONS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I wanted to comment just a moment on an effort we made last week and intend to make again tomorrow relating to the affairs in the Taiwan Strait. All of us know that there has been now for some time a series of threats, a series of missiles, a series of live-ammunition military maneuvers by the People's Republic designed, we believe and I believe, to intimidate the Taiwanese election that comes up this week. Certainly, our country and the world, indeed, has a great interest in what happens in this area, partly because of our efforts to improve our relationship with the People's Republic of China—a relationship that will be increasingly important as time goes by, increasingly important to the Pacific rim and to the Asian